

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed October 4, 2004, the shortened statutory period for filing a response having expired on January 4, 2005. In this regard, Applicant submits herewith a two-month extension petition to reset the deadline for responding to the Official Action to and including March 4, 2005. In view of the within response, reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

The present application initially included claims 1-42 directed to the proposed invention. Applicant has cancelled all claims without disclaimer or prejudice. In lieu thereof, Applicant submits newly proposed claims 43-53 for consideration by the Examiner. The newly proposed claims further define the previously claimed invention as distinguished over the prior art cited by the Examiner in the Official Action. No new matter has been presented with respect to Applicant's newly submitted claims. Specific support for these claim limitations are found throughout Applicant's specification.

In the Official Action, the Examiner cites *Takahashi*, WO/97-36261 as the primary reference. In this regard, the Examiner states that:

*Takahashi et al.* discloses an image processing method executed by a computer (video game) wherein the position of the viewpoint can be moved in real time in response to a positional relationship, which is constantly changing as the player controls the game, it is possible to achieve fine, stepless movement of the viewpoint, in contrast to conventional technology which provides only several types of viewpoint. By the change of screens accompanying this movement of the viewpoint, the player can view the game from the optimum viewpoint at all times. For example, if the character is going up a slope, a viewpoint looking upwards is adopted so that a good view of the top of the slope is obtained, while if the character is leaping across a deep valley, by looking directly downwards, the width of the valley can be perceived

readily. The viewpoint is moved automatically, requiring no operation by the player (other than controlling the game character); therefore, no extra burden is placed on the player.

The Examiner's explanation as to the teachings of *Takahashi et al.* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 43, there is no disclosure in *Takahashi et al.* of Applicant's claim limitations as set forth as follows:

a player character position/motion detecting section for detecting position and motion of a player character based on the contents of the analyzed command data when the analyzed command data is a command for motion of the character; and

said image managing section comprising a mode switching section for selecting one of a bird's eye view mode process, a subjective mode process, and a behind mode process in accordance with the detected position and motion of the player, wherein the bird's eye view mode is selected when the player character is detected to be moving, the subjective mode process is selected when the player character is detected to be stopping while the player character is able to move and the player is operating, and the behind mode process is selected when the player character is positioned at a wall and region where the back of the player character is invisible,

wherein when the bird's eye view mode process is selected, said image managing section produces the display data of the scene image for objectively viewing the state of motion for the player character,

wherein when the subjective mode process is selected, said image managing section produces the display data of the scene image for subjectively viewed by the player character's viewpoint, and

wherein when the behind mode process is selected, said image managing section produces the display data of the scene image for viewing the player character and a region behind the wall.

Turning to *Takahashi et al.*, the reference incorporates a camera viewpoint for the character such as shown in Fig. 4. The

image taken by the camera is displayed on the monitor, *i.e.*, the camera represents the player's line of sight. In implementing the camera viewpoint in *Takahashi et al.*, there is ascertained the relationship between the player's character and the landscape in a process referred to as "camera coordinates and angle determination." Briefly, the character figure and peripheral figures are set in a virtual spacial coordinate system. The viewpoint is ascertained by determining a first point on the character figure and determining a second point on the peripheral figure on the basis of the first point. The line of sight is determined on the basis of the first and second points, whereupon image display signals are generated corresponding to the image view from the viewpoint in the direction of the line of sight. For example, the first point may be set inside the character's head, while the second point may be set on the surface of the landscape at a pre-described distance from the first point. The particulars of calculating the focal point and line of sight are identified in steps S1 and S2 on page 7 of *Takahashi et al.* This methodology of *Takahashi et al.* is used in the illustrative embodiments, for example, in Fig. 6 where there are slopes and ravines, and in Fig. 10, where there is depicted a fighting scene with enemy characters.

What is clear from *Takahashi et al.* is that there is no disclosure of Applicant's claim aforementioned limitations, particularly with selecting a bird's eye view mode process, a subjective mode process, and a behind mode process, all as set forth in claim 43. It appears that the Examiner agrees with Applicant's position that the various viewing modes, *i.e.*, bird's eye view, subjective view, and behind view are not disclosed in *Takahashi et al.* Rather, the Examiner contends that such would be obvious, and in particular, to accept the

players input from a joystick to interchange generally between views.

However, in order to render Applicant's claims obvious, there must be a teaching or suggestion in the prior art of these precise features, as well as a suggestion for their combination with *Takahashi et al.* The Examiner has failed not only to identify these claim limitations of Applicant's claim which are not disclosed in *Takahashi et al.*, but any suggestion in the prior art for incorporating same in *Takahashi et al.* Thus, as a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection is traversed and must therefore be withdrawn.

With respect to Applicant's independent claim 49, such claim is patentable over the cited prior art for those reasons noted hereinabove with respect to claim 43.

Turning to independent claim 47, there is no disclosure in the prior art of Applicant's claimed invention which includes, *inter alia*, the limitations as follows:

a sound effects producing section which produces a sound effect corresponding to the position and motion of said character,

wherein said scene image producing section produces a first scene image when said character is stopped in a movable state and a second scene image when said character is moved, said first scene image subjectively viewed by said character and said second scene image objectively viewing the motion of said character, and

and wherein when said character is hidden by an object in said second scene image, said scene image producing section produces said first scene image regardless of movement of said character, and

wherein said sound effects producing section produces the sound effect of a magnitude corresponding to the distance from the source of sound to the character when said first scene image is displayed.

The Examiner recognizes that *Takahashi et al.* does not disclose Applicant's limitation regarding a character being

hidden by an object in a scene image. To this end, the Examiner refers to *Rieder*, United States Patent No. 5,769,718. The Examiner states that *Rieder* discloses that when a character is detected as being behind a wall, the wall becomes transparent so that the objects behind the wall can be displayed. This disclosure of *Rieder* does not render obvious Applicant's claimed invention. As noted hereinabove, the aforementioned claim limitation specifically states that "wherein when said character is hidden by an object in said second scene image, said second scene image producing section produces said first scene image regardless of movement of said character." *Rieder's* disclosure of making the wall transparent is not relevant to the aforementioned limitation as set forth in claim 47. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is considered traverse and should therefore be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Examiner recognizes that *Takahashi et al.* does not disclose Applicant's limitation of producing sound effects. To this end, the Examiner refers to *Mukojima et al.*, United States Patent No. 5,768,393 as disclosing a sound source processor unit that controls sound to be generated according to the position direction of an object. Sound production in video games is not considered unique. However, the prior art including *Mukojima et al.* does not disclose Applicant's claim limitation of "wherein said sound effects producing section produces the sound effect of a magnitude corresponding to the distance from the source of sound to the character when said first scene image is displayed." As the prior art is silent as to this limitation, the Examiner's rejection is considered traverse and should therefore be withdraw.

With respect to independent claim 53, this claim is deemed patentable over the prior art for those reasons previously set forth with respect to independent claim 47.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If, there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen B. Goldman

Registration No.: 28,512

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant